arXiv:hep-th/0503116v2 21 Mar 2005

IP/BBSR/2004-28
hep-th/0503116

$\mathcal{N} = 2$ σ-model Action on Non(anti)commutative Superspace

B. Chandrasekhar*

Institute of Physics, Bhubaneswar 751 005, INDIA

ABSTRACT

We show that the infinite series in the classical action for non(anti)commutative $\mathcal{N} = 2$, σ-models in two dimensions, can be resummed by using constraint equations of the auxiliary fields. We argue that the resulting action takes a standard form and the target space is necessarily smeared by terms dependent on the deformation parameter.

February 1, 2008

---

*chandra@iopb.res.in

Nonlinear Sigma models in two dimensions on general target spaces have given inumerable physical insights in to various branches of Physics and Mathematics. Supersymmetric extension of bosonic sigma models unfolded new avenues in the study of complex geometry. In particular, extension to $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supersymmetry forces the target manifold to be Kähler [1]-[4], which plays a crucial role in showing the consistency of these sigma models at the quantum level. The importance of the sigma model approach to the study of string compactifications on Ricci-flat Kähler manifolds (otherwise Calabi-yau manifolds) and also string propagation in arbitrary background fields is well known. Due to such varied interests, Non-commutative [5] deformations of these sigma models have also been actively pursued [6].

Recently, the emergence of a new non(anti)commutative superspace deformation has opened up an interesting arena, ensuing from Dijkgraaf-Vafa relations and the consideration of superstrings in graviphoton background fields [7, 8, 9]. However, it turns out that such a superspace deformation is only possible in a Euclidean space [10]. Following the work in [8], various aspects of supersymmetric theories with non(anti)commutative deformation are being actively investigated. Here, one only retains half of the supersymmetry generators of the theory. For other kinds of supersymmetric deformations and harmonic superspace approaches see [11, 12].

To understand the conformal structure of non(anti)commutative theories in two dimensions, we studied the classical aspects of σ-models defined on non(anti)commutative (NAC) superspace with a general Kähler potential [13, 14]. It was shown that due to the NAC deformation, the classical action has infinitely many terms. Despite this fact, it is possible to write down the action in a closed form, after identifying the emergence of a series expansion in the NAC parameter. However, in its present form, the action appears complicated and is inaccessible even in the classical domain. Moreover, the auxiliary fields cannot be eliminated directly, due to the infinite series. On the otherhand, to prove the consistency of these NAC σ-models, it is important to establish various results, such as quantum renormalizability, conformal invariance etc., Conformal invariance for instance, is essential to obtain the equations of motion of superstrings propagating in arbitrary background fields.

To understand such interesting aspects, in this letter, we show that the infinite series in the classical action of the NAC sigma models can be resummed and in the resulting action the target space appears smeared. We argue that the new form of the action establishes a good connection with the $C = 0$ σ-models and may turn out be useful in drawing important conclusions about the quantum and conformal structure.

Note added: During the final stages of this draft, ref. [15] appeared on the arXiv, where the resummation of the action with superpotential terms is discussed and the smearing of the target space is understood as deformation of Zumino's lagrangian.

We follow the notations of [14]. The 2D superspace variables are $\theta^{\pm}, \bar{\theta}^{\pm}, x^0, x^3$ and y^0, y^3 stand for the chiral coordinates. The world-sheet is deformed as:

$$\{\theta^{\alpha}, \theta^{\beta}\} = C^{\alpha\beta}, \tag{1}$$

where α, β run over $+, -$. Rest of the (anti)commutation relations between $\theta, \bar{\theta}, x^0, x^3$ are zero [8, 14]. The $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supersymmetry generators $Q_\pm = -\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta^\pm}$, $\bar{Q}_\pm = -\frac{\partial}{\partial\bar{\theta}^\pm} - 2i\theta^\pm \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial y^0} \pm \frac{\partial}{\partial y^3}\right)$ satisfy,

$$\{Q_\pm, \bar{Q}_\pm\} = -2i(\frac{\partial}{\partial y^0} \pm \frac{\partial}{\partial y^3}), \tag{2}$$

but, $\{\bar{Q}_\pm, \bar{Q}_\pm\} \neq 0$, which is due to the nonlinearity of $\bar{Q}$'s. As a result we only work with the $\mathcal{N} = 1/2$ supersymmetry generators, $Q_\pm$. Here, we also note that the superspace deformation in eqn. (1), is only possible in Euclidean space and there are no complex conjugation conditions on any fields [17, 18, 14].

The component form of the $\mathcal{N} = 2$ σ-model action with a superspace deformation as given in eqn. (1), can be derived from a superspace integral over the Kähler potential. Details of the derivation are given in [13, 14] and below we only quote the final result:

$$\begin{aligned} I \;=\; & -\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}(-1)^n(\det C)^{n-1}\int d^2x \frac{F^{i_1}F^{i_2}\cdots F^{i_{2n-2}}}{(2n-1)!}\Big[\psi_-^{i_{2n-1}}\psi_+^{i_{2n}}\bar{F}^j\,\mathcal{K}_{,i_1i_2\cdots i_{2n}\bar{j}} + \psi_-^{i_{2n-1}}\bar{\psi}_-^j\psi_+^{i_{2n}}\bar{\psi}_+^k \\ & \times\; \mathcal{K}_{,i_1i_2\cdots i_{2n}\bar{j}\bar{k}}\Big] \;+\; \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}(\det C)^n(-1)^n \int d^2x\, F^{i_1}F^{i_2}\cdots F^{i_{2n-1}}\Big[\frac{1}{(2n)!}F^{i_{2n}}\partial_{\xi^-}\partial_{\zeta^-}\bar{\phi}^j\,\mathcal{K}_{,i_1i_2\cdots i_{2n}\bar{j}} \\ & + \frac{1}{(2n+1)!}\Big(2n\,\psi_-^{i_{2n}}\psi_+^{i_{2n+1}}\partial_{\xi^-}\partial_{\zeta^-}\bar{\phi}^j + iF^{i_{2n}}\psi_-^{i_{2n+1}}\partial_{\zeta^-}\bar{\psi}_-^j + iF^{i_{2n}}\psi_+^{i_{2n+1}}\partial_{\xi^-}\bar{\psi}_+ + F^{i_{2n}}F^{i_{2n+1}}\bar{F}^j\Big) \\ & \times\; \mathcal{K}_{,i_1i_2\cdots i_{2n+1}\bar{j}} + \frac{1}{(2n)!}\,F^{i_{2n}}\partial_{\xi^-}\bar{\phi}^j\partial_{\zeta^-}\bar{\phi}^k\,\mathcal{K}_{,i_1i_2\cdots i_{2n}\bar{j}\bar{k}} + \frac{1}{(2n+1)!}\Big(2n\psi_-^{i_{2n}}\psi_+^{i_{2n+1}}\partial_{\xi^-}\bar{\phi}^j\partial_{\zeta^-}\bar{\phi}^k \\ & -\; F^{i_{2n}}F^{i_{2n+1}}\bar{\psi}_-^j\bar{\psi}_+^k - F^{i_{2n}}\bar{\psi}_-^j\psi_-^{i_{2n+1}}\partial_{\zeta^-}\bar{\phi}^k - F^{i_{2n}}\bar{\psi}_+^j\psi_+^{i_{2n+1}}\partial_{\xi^-}\bar{\phi}^k\Big)\mathcal{K}_{,i_1i_2\cdots i_{2n+1}\bar{j}\bar{k}}\Big]. \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where Φ^i and $\bar{\Phi}^i$ are the $\mathcal{N} = 2$ superfields and the scalar function $\mathcal{K}$ is the Kähler potential. Further, we have for convenience, $\xi^- = \frac{1}{2}(x^0 - x^3) - i\theta^-\bar{\theta}^-$, $\zeta^- = \frac{1}{2}(x^0 + x^3) - i\theta^+\bar{\theta}^+$. We also have the notation:

$$\mathcal{K}_{,i_1i_2\cdots i_n\bar{j}_1\bar{j}_2\cdots\bar{j}_m} = \frac{\partial^{(n+m)}\mathcal{K}}{\partial\Phi^{i_1}\partial\Phi^{i_2}\cdots\partial\Phi^{i_n}\partial\bar{\Phi}^{j_1}\partial\bar{\Phi}^{j_2}\cdots\partial\bar{\Phi}^{j_m}}|_{\Phi^i=\phi^i,\bar{\Phi}^i=\bar{\phi}^i}, \tag{4}$$

for the derivatives of the Kähler potential with respect to the chiral and anti-chiral superfields evaluated at $\Phi^i = \phi^i$ and $\bar{\Phi}^i = \bar{\phi}^i$. The above action for the non(anti)commutative σ-models is a series expansion in $(\det C)$. Despite the presence of infinite terms, the action (3) has been shown be invariant under the $\mathcal{N} = 1/2$ supersymmetry of the theory [13], which is a further check that the action in the component form is correct.

For the special case of $C = 0$, the action in eqn. (3) reduces to the standard $\mathcal{N} = 2\,\sigma$-model action. In that case, it is possible to eliminate the auxiliary fields by their equations of motion, given as:

$$F^i = -\psi_-^j\psi_+^k\,\Gamma^i_{jk}, \tag{5}$$

with a similar relation for $\bar{F}$. The resulting non-linear σ model action takes the form:

$$I_o \;=\; \int d^2x\left[(\partial_{\xi^-}\phi^i\partial_{\zeta^-}\bar{\phi}^j + i\psi_-^i\mathbf{D}_{\zeta^-}\bar{\psi}_-^j + i\psi_+^i\mathbf{D}_{\xi^-}\bar{\psi}_+^j)\,g_{i\bar{j}} - \psi_-^i\bar{\psi}_-^k\psi_+^j\bar{\psi}_+^l\mathcal{R}_{\bar{j}\bar{k}i\bar{l}}\right], \tag{6}$$

with the covariant derivative defined as $\mathbf{D}_{\xi^-}\bar{\psi}^i_+ = \partial_{\xi^-}\bar{\psi}^i_+ + \Gamma^{\bar{i}}_{\bar{j}\bar{k}}\bar{\psi}^j_+\,\partial_{\xi^-}\bar{\phi}^k$ and similarly for $\bar{\psi}^i_-$. Here, $g_{i\bar{j}} = \partial_i\partial_{\bar{j}}\mathcal{K}$ corresponds to the background metric, Γ^i_{jk} denote the Christoffel symbols and $\mathcal{R}_{j\bar{k}i\bar{l}}$ is the Riemann curvature tensor of the target manifold. However, due to the infinite number of terms in the $C \neq 0$ sigma model action (3), solving for the auxiliary fields seems difficult [14]. Here, we would first like to show that F still satisfies a non-trivial constraint equation, although this is not obvious from the n^{th} order action in (3).

It is possible to write down terms in the action to a particular order in $(\det C)$. Thus $I = I_0 + I_C$, to order $(\det C)$ can be written as:

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
I &=& \displaystyle\int d^2x\Big[(\frac{1}{2}\partial_{\xi^-}\phi^i\partial_{\zeta^-}\bar{\phi}^j + \frac{1}{2}\partial_{\zeta^-}\phi^i\partial_{\xi^-}\bar{\phi}^j + i\psi^i_-\partial_{\zeta^-}\bar{\psi}^j_- + i\psi^i_+\partial_{\xi^-}\bar{\psi}^j_+ + F^i\bar{F}^j)g_{i\bar{j}} + \psi^i_-\psi^j_+\bar{F}^k \\
&\times& \Gamma_{ij\bar{k}} + (i\psi^i_-\bar{\psi}^j_-\partial_{\zeta^-}\bar{\phi}^k + i\psi^i_+\bar{\psi}^j_+\partial_{\xi^-}\bar{\phi}^k - F^i\bar{\psi}^j_-\bar{\psi}^k_+)\Gamma_{i\bar{j}\bar{k}} + (\psi^i_-\bar{\psi}^k_-\psi^j_+\bar{\psi}^l_+)\partial_i\Gamma_{j\bar{k}\bar{l}} + (\det C)\ F^p \\
&\times& \Big[-\dfrac{F^q}{6}\Big\{\psi^l_-\psi^m_+\bar{F}^j\partial_p\partial_q\Gamma_{lm\bar{j}} + \psi^l_-\bar{\psi}^j_-\psi^m_+\bar{\psi}^k_+\partial_p\partial_q\partial_l\Gamma_{m\bar{j}\bar{k}}\Big\} - \dfrac{1}{2}F^q\partial_{\xi^-}\partial_{\zeta^-}\bar{\phi}^j\Gamma_{pq\bar{j}} - \dfrac{1}{6}\Big(2\psi^q_-\psi^l_+ \\
&\times& \partial_{\xi^-}\partial_{\zeta^-}\bar{\phi}^j + iF^q\psi^l_-\partial_{\zeta^-}\bar{\psi}^j_- + iF^q\psi^l_+\partial_{\xi^-}\bar{\psi}_+ + F^qF^l\bar{F}^j\Big)\partial_p\Gamma_{ql\bar{j}} - \dfrac{1}{2}\,F^q\partial_{\xi^-}\bar{\phi}^j\partial_{\zeta^-}\bar{\phi}^k\,\partial_p\Gamma_{q\bar{j}\bar{k}} \\
&-& \dfrac{1}{6}\Big(2\psi^q_-\psi^l_+\partial_{\xi^-}\bar{\phi}^j\partial_{\zeta^-}\bar{\phi}^k - F^qF^l\bar{\psi}^j_-\bar{\psi}^k_+ - F^q\bar{\psi}^j_-\psi^l_-\partial_{\zeta^-}\bar{\phi}^k - F^q\bar{\psi}^j_+\psi^l_+\partial_{\xi^-}\bar{\phi}^k\Big)\partial_p\partial_q\Gamma_{l\bar{j}\bar{k}}\Big].
\end{array} \qquad (7)$$

For lucidity, we confine the discussion to terms in the action to first order in $(\det C)$ as given in eqn. (7). Generalization to all orders can be easily done. After some rearrangement, the action takes the form:

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
I &=& \displaystyle\int d^2x\Big[(\frac{1}{2}\partial_{\xi^-}\phi^i\partial_{\zeta^-}\bar{\phi}^j + \frac{1}{2}\partial_{\zeta^-}\phi^i\partial_{\xi^-}\bar{\phi}^j)g_{i\bar{j}} + (\det C)\ F^p\,\{\frac{1}{2}F^q\partial_{\xi^-}\partial_{\zeta^-}\bar{\phi}^j\,\Gamma_{pq\bar{j}} \\
&+& \dfrac{1}{3}\,\psi^q_-\psi^l_+\partial_{\xi^-}\partial_{\zeta^-}\bar{\phi}^j\partial_p\Gamma_{ql\bar{j}} + \dfrac{1}{2}\,F^q\partial_{\xi^-}\bar{\phi}^j\partial_{\zeta^-}\bar{\phi}^k\,\partial_p\Gamma_{q\bar{j}\bar{k}} + \dfrac{1}{3}\,\psi^q_-\psi^l_+\partial_{\xi^-}\bar{\phi}^j\partial_{\zeta^-}\bar{\phi}^k\partial_p\partial_q\Gamma_{l\bar{j}\bar{k}}\} \\
&+& \Big(i\psi^i_-\partial_{\zeta^-}\bar{\psi}^j_- + i\psi^i_+\partial_{\xi^-}\bar{\psi}^j_+ + F^i\bar{F}^j\Big)\tilde{g}_{i\bar{j}} + \psi^i_-\psi^j_+\bar{F}^k\tilde{\Gamma}_{ij\bar{k}} + (i\psi^i_-\bar{\psi}^j_-\partial_{\zeta^-}\bar{\phi}^k + i\psi^i_+\bar{\psi}^j_+\partial_{\xi^-}\bar{\phi}^k \\
&-& F^i\bar{\psi}^j_-\bar{\psi}^k_+)\tilde{\Gamma}_{i\bar{j}\bar{k}} + (\psi^i_-\bar{\psi}^k_-\psi^j_+\bar{\psi}^l_+)\partial_i\tilde{\Gamma}_{j\bar{k}\bar{l}}\Big].
\end{array} \qquad (8)$$

Here, new geometric quantities with an additional tilde as seen in eqn. (8), are redefined. For instance, the metric is redefined as:

$$\tilde{g}_{i\bar{j}} = g_{i\bar{j}} - \frac{1}{6}(\det C)F^pF^q\partial_p\partial_q g_{i\bar{j}}. \qquad (9)$$

and for the Christoffel symbols in the action (8), we have the new definition:

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_{kl\bar{j}} = \Gamma_{kl\bar{j}} - \frac{1}{6}(\det C)F^pF^q\partial_p\partial_q\Gamma_{kl\bar{j}}. \qquad (10)$$

At this stage, the results in eqns. (9) and (10) follow from the rearrangement done in the action (8). However, it is not clear whether one can independently calculate the Christoffels from the redefined metric given in eqn. (9) and show that it is identical to the result in eqn.

(10). We comment more on this issue later on. This check is infact important, as it elucidates whether the C-deformation on the worldsheet induces any kind of torsion terms on the target space manifold.

In the action (8), most of the terms proportional to $(\det C)$ have been rearranged in such a way that, they only modify the geometric quantities of the zeroth order action. However, some terms involving the derivatives of bosonic scalar fields are left untouched. These terms can be rearranged by doing partial integrations as shown below:

$$\partial_{\xi^-}\partial_{\zeta^-}\bar{\phi}^j\,\Gamma_{pq\bar{j}} = -\partial_{\xi^-}\phi^l\partial_{\zeta^-}\bar{\phi}^j\partial_l\Gamma_{pq\bar{j}} - \partial_{\xi^-}\bar{\phi}^l\partial_{\zeta^-}\bar{\phi}^j\partial_{\bar{l}}\Gamma_{pq\bar{j}} \tag{11}$$

Doing similar partial integration on other terms, we arrive at:

$$\begin{aligned} I &= \int d^2x\,\Big[\,(\frac{1}{2}\partial_{\xi^-}\phi^i\partial_{\zeta^-}\bar{\phi}^j + \frac{1}{2}\partial_{\zeta^-}\phi^i\partial_{\xi^-}\bar{\phi}^j)\,(g_{i\bar{j}} - (\det C)\,F^p\{\frac{1}{2}F^q\,\partial_i\Gamma_{pq\bar{j}} + \frac{1}{3}\,\psi_-^q\psi_+^l\,\partial_i\partial_q\Gamma_{l\bar{j}\bar{k}}\}\,) \\ &+ (i\psi_-^i\partial_{\zeta^-}\bar{\psi}_-^j + i\psi_+^i\partial_{\xi^-}\bar{\psi}_+^j + F^i\bar{F}^j)\tilde{g}_{i\bar{j}} + (\psi_-^i\psi_+^j\bar{F}^k)\tilde{\Gamma}_{ij\bar{k}} \\ &+ (i\psi_-^i\bar{\psi}_-^j\partial_{\zeta^-}\bar{\phi}^k + i\psi_+^i\bar{\psi}_+^j\partial_{\xi^-}\bar{\phi}^k - F^i\bar{\psi}_-^j\bar{\psi}_+^k)\tilde{\Gamma}_{i\bar{j}\bar{k}} + (\psi_-^i\bar{\psi}_-^k\psi_+^j\bar{\psi}_+^l)\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_{ij\bar{k}\bar{l}}\Big]. \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

To simplify the action further, let us now look at the equation of motion of the auxiliary fields. Due to the various powers of the auxiliary field F appearing in the above action, equation of motion of $\bar{F}$ cannot be derived directly. The equation of motion of F at first order in $(\det C)$ can however be shown to be[†] (after renaming some dummy indices):

$$\tilde{g}_{i\bar{j}}\,F^i + \psi_-^k\psi_+^l\,\tilde{\Gamma}_{kl\bar{j}} = 0. \tag{13}$$

This is infact quite similar to the solution for F to lowest order in $(\det C)$ given in eqn. (5); but not quite the same, as various geometric quantities are redefined. If one naively attempts to check whether the lowest order solution can still work, i.e., by substituting the result of eqn. (5) in (13), one finds a non-zero piece of the kind $\frac{1}{6}(\det C)F^pF^q\psi_-^l\psi_+^m g_{i\bar{j}}\partial_p\partial_q\Gamma^i_{lm}$.

Thus, in a nutshell, we have found an exact solution to the equations of motion of auxiliary field F, in terms of new geometric quantities. Later we will argue that eqn. (13) is in fact an all order solution for F.

In order to simplify the action further, terms bilinear in the bosonic fields have to be understood. For this, we recollect that the classical action for non(anti)commutative sigma model can be divided in to two parts $I = I_o + I_c$, where I_o and I_c are the C-independent and the C-dependent parts respectively. I_o is neatly summarized in eqn. (6) and I_c can deduced from eqn. (3). We note that I_o and I_c can be shown to be independenly invariant under $\mathcal{N} = 1/2$ supersymmetry of the theory [13], and can be dealt seperately. We now use this fact to derive the equation of motion of auxiliary field F for the C-dependent and C-independent parts seperately, from eqn. (13). Collecting terms proportional to zeroth and first order in $(\det C)$ on both sides of eqn. (13), we have respectively:

[†] Solutions to auxiliary fields in four dimensions have also been discussed in [19, 20]

$$
\begin{aligned}
g_{i\bar{j}}\,F^i &= -\psi_-^k\psi_+^l\,\Gamma_{kl\bar{j}}, && (14)\\
\partial_p\partial_q g_{i\bar{j}}\,F^i &= -\psi_-^k\psi_+^l\,\partial_p\partial_q\Gamma_{kl\bar{j}}. && (15)
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus, using eqn. (15) in eqn. (12), the $\mathcal{N}=2$ non(anti)commutative σ-model action takes the standard form:

$$
\begin{aligned}
I &= \int d^2x\,\Big[\,(\frac{1}{2}\partial_{\xi^-}\phi^i\partial_{\zeta^-}\bar{\phi}^j+\frac{1}{2}\partial_{\zeta^-}\phi^i\partial_{\xi^-}\bar{\phi}^j+i\psi_-^i\partial_{\zeta^-}\bar{\psi}_-^j+i\psi_+^i\partial_{\xi^-}\bar{\psi}_+^j+F^i\bar{F}^j)\tilde{g}_{i\bar{j}}+(\psi_-^i\psi_+^j\bar{F}^k)\\
&\times\ \tilde{\Gamma}_{ij\bar{k}}+(i\psi_-^i\bar{\psi}_-^j\partial_{\zeta^-}\bar{\phi}^k+i\psi_+^i\bar{\psi}_+^j\partial_{\xi^-}\bar{\phi}^k-F^i\bar{\psi}_-^j\bar{\psi}_+^k)\tilde{\Gamma}_{i\bar{j}\bar{k}}+(\psi_-^i\bar{\psi}_-^k\psi_+^j\bar{\psi}_+^l)\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_{ij\bar{k}\bar{l}}\Big], \qquad (16)
\end{aligned}
$$

The fact that the non(anti)commutative sigma model action in eqn. (16) is of the same form as the $C=0$ σ-model action is really intriguing. Notice however, that all the geometric quantities are redefined and contain C-dependent terms explicitly. For instance, the new metric is related to the old metric by the addition of higher derivative C-dependent terms, as seen in eqn. (9). Thus, in the process of simplyfying the sigma model action, terms ensuing from the C-deformation on the worldsheet have been transfered to the target space geometry.

To be precise, in the action (16), the redefined target space metric apperas fuzzy. This is rather counter intuitive, as only the fermionic coordinates on the world-sheet are deformed by the relations in eqn. (1). If the deformation was introduced for the bosonic coordinates, then the bosonic components of the chiral superfields will have to be multiplied using a new star product, which have the effect of making the target space geometry fuzzy. However, in the present case, the bosonic fields which act as target space coordinates do not get affected by the deformation (1). In the following, we see whether going over to appropriate normal coordinates can undo the smearing of the target space geometry due to the deformation terms.

Although, the analysis so far was for the sigma model action to first order in $(\det C)$, it is straightforward to generalize the results to the full action. The partial integrations pointed out in eqn. (11) can be carried over in a similar way. However, there will still be one piece remaining as in eqn. (12). In general, the bosonic part of the action will look as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\int d^2x\,\Big[\,(\frac{1}{2}\partial_{\xi^-}\phi^i\partial_{\zeta^-}\bar{\phi}^j+\frac{1}{2}\partial_{\zeta^-}\phi^i\partial_{\xi^-}\bar{\phi}^j)\,(g_{i\bar{j}}+\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}(\det C)^n\,(-1)^nF^{i_1}F^{i_2}\cdots F^{2n-1}\\
&\times\ \{\frac{1}{(2n)}\,F^{2n}\mathcal{K}_{i_1\cdots i_{2n}i\bar{j}}+\frac{1}{(2n+1)}\,\psi_-^{2n}\psi_+^{2n+1}\,\mathcal{K}_{i_1\cdots i_{2n+1}i\bar{j}}\}\,)\Big] \qquad (17)
\end{aligned}
$$

To get the bosonic part in the standard form, one has to derive the equation of motion of auxiliary fields for the all order action in eqn. (3).

We claim that the auxiliary field F still satisfies the same constraint equation as given in eqn. (5). However, various geometric quantities such as metric and christoffels will now contain many higher derivative terms in the deformation parameter C. One can show this explicitly and we argue it to be so, by looking at the following term in the all order action in eqn. (3):

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}(\det C)^n(-1)^n \int d^2x \, \frac{F^{i_1}F^{i_2}\cdots F^{i_{2n}}}{(2n+1)!}\Big(i\psi_-^{i_{2n+1}}\partial_{\zeta^-}\bar{\psi}_-^{\bar{j}} + i\psi_+^{i_{2n+1}}\partial_{\xi^-}\bar{\psi}_+ + F^{i_{2n+1}}\bar{F}^{\bar{j}} \Big)\partial_{i_1\cdots i_{2n}}\, g_{i_{2n+1}\bar{j}} . \tag{18}$$

From the above equation, one can first deduce how the various geometric quantities get redefined. For example, the metric picks up many new C-dependent terms and takes the general form:

$$\tilde{g}_{i\bar{j}} = g_{i\bar{j}} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n}{(2n+1)!}\,(\det C)^n F^{i_1}F^{i_2}\cdots F^{i_{2n}} g_{i\bar{j},i_1\cdots i_{2n}}, \tag{19}$$

where, as mentioned before, the subscripts of metric g after the comma, indicate derivatives with respect to the corresponding chiral superfield, evaluated at $\Phi = \phi$. One can check the validity of the general form given in eqn. (19), by analyzing other terms in the action (3). The result in eqn. (9) can be obtained as a special case of $n = 1$ from eqn. (19).

To summarize, the all order action in eqn. (3) can be rewritten as in eqn. (12) and the auxiliary field equations take the general form as in eqn. (13). To rearrange the bosonic part of the action, it is possible to derive relations similar to the ones given in eqns. (14) and (15), at every order in $(\det C)$. Hence, at order $(\det C)^n$, F satisfes the following constraint equation:

$$F^i \,\partial_{i_1\cdots i_{2n}}\, g_{i\bar{j}} \;=\; -\,\psi_-^k\psi_+^l \;\partial_{i_1\cdots i_{2n}}\,\Gamma_{kl\bar{j}}\,. \tag{20}$$

Thus, by redefining certain geometric quantities the complicated looking action (3) with infinite terms reduces to an extremly simple form and can be written succintly as in eqn. (16). Since, the terms dependent on $(\det C)$ are not present in the action explicitly, one can eliminate the auxiliary fields F and $\bar{F}$ by their standard equations of motion. However, to show that the classical action for non(anti)commutative sigma model takes the final form as given in eqn. (6), one needs to derive the inverse of new metric given in eqn. (19). Further, with the new metric, one also has to show that $\tilde{\Gamma}^i_{kl} = \tilde{g}^{i\bar{j}}\,\tilde{\Gamma}_{kl\bar{j}}$. These issues are important in understanding the Ricci-flatness conditions of the non(anti)commutative sigma models.

Now, in terms of new coordinates, the action takes a form manifestly invariant under general coordinate transformations. However, the covariance of the action has to be explicitly shown, as the transformation properties of the new geometric quantities as given in eqn. (19) are not clear. Since the NAC sigma model action takes a standard form, it can also be shown to be invariant under the standard $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supersymmetry transformations. This signifies the presence of enhanced supersymmetry in the theory and should be of interest[‡]. Thus, in some sense, we have recovered the standard $\mathcal{N} = 2$ sigma model action on non(anti)commutative superspace[§], albeit with redefined geometric quantities.

[‡] I wish to thank R. Gopakumar for pointing this to me.

[§] For other discussions on this point see [16, 18, 23].

Let us try to understand eqn. (19) more carefully. One notices that there are various powers of $(\det C\, F^2)$, which can be written in terms of superfields as follows:

$$\det C\, F^2 = \det C\,(Q_+\, Q_-\, L)(Q_+\, Q_-\, L). \tag{21}$$

Here $(Q_+\, Q_-\, L)$ by itself is a new superfield and can appear in the action, since we only retain $\mathcal{N} = 1/2$ supersymmetry [18]. Notice that we could have also chosen $\int d^2\theta\, L(Q_+\, Q_-\, L)$ for the superfield form. However at higher orders, this form does not reproduce higher powers of $(\det C)F^2$. Further, due to integration over half of superspace, it is an F-type term and can only arise from the superpotential in two dimensions. In this work we do not consider superpotential terms in the action. However, the resummation also works for the superpotential terms, as has been discussed in [15].

One should keep in mind that on a non(anti)commutative superspace, F and D terms are indistinguishable [16, 18], as new superfields of the kind $\bar\theta\bar\theta R$ etc., can be formed. Using this, one can change a D-term, e.g., $\int d^2\theta d^2\bar\theta L * (\bar\theta\bar\theta R)$ to an F-term $\int d^2\theta\, L * R$. This should be compared with the case in four dimensions, where the natural combination is $(\det C\, F^3)$ and one adds an extra factor of L in eqn. (21). As a result, one requires an additional superspace integral over half of the superspace which gives rise to an F-type term and the NAC action can be written without using start product at the classical level. But, at the quantum level there are new terms which do not have classical counterparts [16, 18]. New terms in the effective action can arise from the new vertex and significantly modify the renormalization properties of the theory at the quantum level [21, 22]. It should be interesting to explore these effects in the two dimensions as well.

Though, we have been working with the component form of the action, for rest of the analysis it will be convenient to work with the superfield form of the action. Using relation (21) we can write the redefined metric (19) as:

$$\tilde g_{i\bar\jmath} = g_{i\bar\jmath} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n}{(2n+1)!}\,(\det C)^n\,[Q_+\, Q_-\, L]^{2n}\, g_{i\bar\jmath, i_1\cdots i_{2n}} \tag{22}$$

Further, one can rewrite the non(anti)commutative sigma model action given in eqn. (16), in terms of the superfields as follows (after some partial integrations):

$$I_0 = \int d^2x\, d^2\theta\,\Big[\,\frac{1}{2!}\, L^i * R^j\, \tilde g_{i\bar\jmath} + \frac{1}{3!}\, L^i * L^j * R^k\, \tilde\Gamma_{ij\bar k} + \frac{1}{3!}\, L^i * R^j * R^k\, \tilde\Gamma_{i\bar\jmath\bar k} + \cdots\Big]. \tag{23}$$

To explore the relation between $\tilde g$ and g, let us consider the first term in the action (23). In other words, we multiply both sides of eqn. (22) by $L^i * R^j$ and explicitly write down the first few terms in eqn. (22) as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde g_{i\bar\jmath}\, L^i * R^j \;&=\; g_{i\bar\jmath}\, L^i * R^j + \frac{1}{3!}\,(Q_+Q_-L)^{i_1} * (Q_+Q_-L)^{i_2} * L^i * R^j\, \partial_{i_2}\, \Gamma_{ii_1\bar\jmath} \\
&+\; \frac{1}{5!}\,(Q_+Q_-L)^{i_1} * (Q_+Q_-L)^{i_2} * (Q_+Q_-L)^{i_3} * (Q_+Q_-L)^{i_4} * \\
&\times\; L^i * R^j\, \partial_{i_2}\partial_{i_3}\partial_{i_4}\, \Gamma_{ii_1\bar\jmath} + \cdots .
\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Renaming some dummy indices, we finally arrive at:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{g}_{i\bar{j}}\, L^i * R^j &= g_{m\bar{l}}\, [L^m + \frac{1}{3!}\, (Q_+Q_-L)^{i_1} * (Q_+Q_-L)^{i_2} * L^i\, \partial_{i_2}\, \Gamma_{ii_1\bar{j}}\, g^{m\bar{j}} + \frac{1}{5!}\, (Q_+Q_-L)^{i_1} \\ &\times\ *(Q_+Q_-L)^{i_2} * (Q_+Q_-L)^{i_3} * (Q_+Q_-L)^{i_4} * L^i \partial_{i_2}\partial_{i_3}\partial_{i_4}\, \Gamma_{ii_1\bar{j}}\, g^{m\bar{j}} + \cdots] * R^l\,, \\ &= g_{m\bar{l}}\, [L^m + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(2n+1)!}\, g^{m\bar{j}}\, \partial_{i_3\cdots i_{2n+1}} \Gamma_{i_1 i_2 \bar{j}}\, (Q_+Q_-L)^{2n}\, L^{2n+1}] * R^l\,, \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

We rewrite the the quantity in square brackets in eqn. (25) as:

$$\pi^m = L^m + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(2n+1)!}\, g^{m\bar{j}}\, \partial_{i_3\cdots i_{2n+1}} \mathcal{K}_{i_1 i_2 \bar{j}}\, (Q_+Q_-L)^{2n}\, L^{2n+1}, \tag{26}$$

and note that there are no star products in the definition of π. The new coordinates π resemble the Kähler normal coordinates which were introduced in ref. [24]. These normal coordinates have the advantage that they transform as holomorphic tangent vectors at the origin. However, in our case it remains to be seen whether π's can be taken as new normal coordinates.

In ref. [24], using mathematical induction it was explicitly shown that π's transform as holomorphic tangent vectors on the target Kähler manifold. However, for the present case the proof does not go through, due to the presence of auxliary fields in the new coordinates. Notice, we have many factors of $(Q_+Q_-L) = F$ appearing in eqn. (26). We know that, under a general coordinate transformation of the target space manifold given as, $\Phi'(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) = f(\Phi)$, the auxiliary field F transforms as:

$$F'^i(x) = \frac{\partial f^i(\phi(x))}{\partial \phi^j} F^j - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 f(\phi(x))}{\partial \phi^j \partial \phi^k} \psi_-^j \psi_+^k \tag{27}$$

Although it is still true that in eqn. (26), the generalized connection $\mathcal{K}_{i_1 i_2 \cdots i_{2n+1} \bar{j}}$ transforms as in the standard case [24], the auxiliary fields transformations have an inhomogenious piece in fermions. In the proof outlined in [24], instead of (Q_+Q_-L) one has various powers of L, which transform smoothly (see Appendix C. of [24]). One can explicitly show that π's do not transform as holomorphic tangent vectors on the target manifold.

The above analysis suggests that π's cannot be taken as new normal coordinates. Also, it is not possible to remove the deformation terms in the eqn. (19), by doing any kind of holomorphic coordinate transformation of the target manifold. This asserts that, the deformation of target space due to terms dependent on various powers of auxliary field F and $(\det C)$, is a generic feature of non(anti)commutative sigma models.

The redefinition of the target space metric can also be understood as the redefinition of the Kähler potential itself, as discussed in [15]. All the C-dependent terms appearing in the redefined geometric quantities are non-covariant. The advantage of working with Kähler normal coordinates is that all the terms appearing in the expansion are guaranteed to be covariant. Thus, working with proper Kähler normal coordinates and looking at the expansions of various geometric quantities to a few orders, might give a hint of the smearing of the target space [24, 14].

Due to the redefinition of various geometric quantities, the symmetry between the holomorphic and anti-holomophic terms in the action is formally restored. This symmetry was previously absent, as various powers of $(\det C)$ appeared with powers of F, but there were no corresponding $\bar{F}$ pieces in the action (3). Since, the non(anti)commtuative sigma model action takes a standard form, it should be possible to extend the results of $C = 0$ sigma models, such as quantum renormalizability and conformal invariance to the present case as well.

To take an example, for the standard sigma models at the quantum level, the one-loop β-function goes as $k \,\mathrm{Tr}\, \ln g$, where k is a constant. Now, for the present case, there are no additional vertices at the quantum level, unlike the four dimensional case where $(\det CF^3)$ leads to many new features. Further, since the β-function calculation only depends on the metric, it is tempting to identify the beta function of the non(anti)commutative sigma models with that of the standard sigma models, where g is replaced by $\tilde{g}$. It should be interesting to find out how the Ricci flat conditions look like, in terms of new geometric quantities. Especially, how do the terms dependent on C modify the conformal invariance conditions of the non(anti)commutative sigma models. However, to make concrete progress, the smearing of the target space quantities due the terms dependent on C and the transformation properties of $\tilde{g}$ have to be better understood. It is also essential to derive various geometric quantities starting from $\tilde{g}$ and show that they are globally well defined on the target manifold [25]. Further, one should note that the sigma models studied here are inherently of Euclidean nature and it is interesting to understand how to surpass the conditions in [10] to define the same on minkowski spaces.

Acknowledgments

I wish to thank A. Kumar and A. Sen for useful suggestions. I thank the organizers of International Workshop on String theory (ISM04), Khajuraho, for giving me an opportunity to present this work. I am grateful to the organizers of 9th APCTP/KIAS winter school on string theory, Seoul, for support and warm hospitality during the final stages of this work.

References

[1] B. Zumino, Phys. Lett. B **87**, 203 (1979).

[2] D. Friedan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **45**, 1057 (1980).

[3] L. Alvarez-Gaume and D. Z. Freedman, Phys. Rev. D **22**, 846 (1980) ; Commun. Math. Phys. **80**, 443 (1981).

[4] L. Alvarez-Gaume, D. Z. Freedman and S. Mukhi, Annals Phys. **134**, 85 (1981).

[5] N. Seiberg and E. Witten, JHEP **9909**, 032 (1999) [hep-th/9908142].

[6] H. O. Girotti, M. Gomes, V. O. Rivelles and A. J. da Silva, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **17**, 1503 (2002) [hep-th/0102101].

[7] H. Ooguri and C. Vafa, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **7**, 53 (2003), [hep-th/0302109] ; J. de Boer, P. A. Grassi and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, Phys. Lett. B **574**, 98 (2003), [hep-th/0302078].

[8] N. Seiberg, JHEP **0306**, 010 (2003) [hep-th/0305248].

[9] N. Berkovits and N. Seiberg, JHEP **0307**, 010 (2003) [hep-th/0306226].

[10] D. Klemm, S. Penati and L. Tamassia, Class. Quant. Grav. **20**, 2905 (2003) [hep-th/0104190].

[11] S. Ferrara and M. A. Lledo, JHEP **0005**, 008 (2000) [hep-th/0002084]; S. Ferrara, M. A. Lledo and O. Macia, JHEP **0309**, 068 (2003) [hep-th/0307039].

[12] E. Ivanov, O. Lechtenfeld and B. Zupnik, JHEP **0402**, 012 (2004) [hep-th/0308012].

[13] B. Chandrasekhar and A. Kumar, JHEP **0403**, 013 (2004) [hep-th/0310137].

[14] B. Chandrasekhar, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 125003 (2004) [hep-th/0408184].

[15] L. Alvarez-Gaume and M. A. Vazquez-Mozo, [hep-th/0503016].

[16] R. Britto, B. Feng, and S.J. Rey, JHEP 0307 (2003)067, [hep-th/0306215].

[17] J. Lukierski and W. J. Zakrzewski, Phys. Lett. B **189**, 99 (1987).

[18] S. Terashima, and J. Yee, JHEP **0312**, 053 (2003), [hep-th/0306237].

[19] T. Inami and H. Nakajima, Prog. Theor. Phys. **111**, 961 (2004) [hep-th/0402137].

[20] O. D. Azorkina, A. T. Banin, I. L. Buchbinder and N. G. Pletnev, [hep-th/0502008].

[21] M. T. Grisaru, S. Penati, and A. Romagnoni, JHEP 0308 (2003) 003, [hep-th/0307099] ; R. Britto, and B. Feng, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 201601 (2003), [hep-th/0307165]; A. Romagnoni, JHEP **0310**, 016 (2003), [hep-th/0307209].

[22] R. Britto, B. Feng and S. J. Rey, JHEP **0308**, 001 (2003) [hep-th/0307091]; O. Lunin and S. J. Rey, JHEP **0309** (2003) 045 [hep-th/0307275].

[23] A. Sako and T. Suzuki, JHEP **0411**, 010 (2004) [hep-th/0408226].

[24] K. Higashijima and M. Nitta, Prog. Theor. Phys. **105**, 243 (2001) [hep-th/0006027]; K. Higashijima, E. Itou and M. Nitta, Prog. Theor. Phys. **108**, 185 (2002) [hep-th/0203081].

[25] D. Nemeschansky and A. Sen, Phys. Lett. B **178**, 365 (1986).